UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,023	08/27/2003	James Bertram Blackmon	7784-107/ DVA	5133

27572 7590 10/17/2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
ROSSI, JESSICA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1733	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,023	BLACKMON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jessica L. Rossi	1733	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *8/8/06, Amd*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-15 and 17-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-15 and 17-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment dated 8/8/06. Claim 2 was cancelled and its limitations were incorporated into claim 1. Claim 16 was cancelled and its limitations were incorporated into claim 11.

2. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Schreiber et al., as set forth in paragraph 5 of the previous action, has been withdrawn in light of the present amendment. The rejections of claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimodaira et al. or Shimodaira et al. in view of Becht, as set forth in paragraphs 11-12 of the previous action, have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's arguments bottom of p. 14 – p. 15; Shimodaira teaches away from forming the light reflective surface until after forming the glass member.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, it recites the limitation "the mirror" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to replace "glass structure" with --mirror assembly-- in line 1 and to replace "glass member" with --mirror-- in line 2.

Regarding claim 10, if Applicant makes the changes noted above, then it is unclear as to how claim 10 further limits claim 1. It is suggested to cancel claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimodaira et al. (US 4807969, of record)

With respect to claim 1, Shimodaira teaches a method for forming a glass structure by providing a glass member 7 with a front surface and a rear surface and securing a rigid interlayer 4 to the rear surface of the glass member (Figure 2; column 2, line 60 – column 3, line 4). The reference teaches the interlayer comprising a resin which shrinks as it cures (column 3, lines 15-16); therefore, since the rigid interlayer of the present invention applies a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member because the resin comprising the interlayer shrinks as it cures (p. 5, last four lines of last paragraph), one would readily appreciate that the rigid interlayer of Shimodaira would also apply a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member.

The reference teaches securing a reinforcing structure 5 to the rigid interlayer and securing a support member 4a to the reinforcing structure (Figure 3; column 3, lines 24-38).

It is noted that Shimodaira teaches the glass structure being a mirror (abstract).

Regarding claim 6, the reference teaches such (column 2, lines 60-61).

Regarding claim 8, the reference teaches such (column 1; lines 20-24; column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 4; column 4, lines 15-16).

Regarding claim 10, the reference teaches such (column 1, lines 8-9 and 25).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations were addressed above with respect to claims 1, 8 and 10, except the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection and the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror.

As for the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection, the reference teaches such (Figure 2; column 2, lines 24-25).

As for the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror, Applicant is directed to the commentary made above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, the reference teaches such.

Regarding claims 13-14, the reference teaches such (Figure 2; column 2, lines 60-61).

Regarding claim 17, the reference teaches the reinforcing structure having an interlayer 5 and a support structure 4a (Figure 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimodaira et al. as applied to claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14 and 17 above.

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to use a vacuum tool to form the glass member to its predetermined shape because such is notoriously well know and conventional in the glass forming art.

Regarding claim 9, selection of a particular curing temperature would have been within purview of the skilled artisan.

9. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimodaira et al. as applied to claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14 and 17 above, and further in view of Stang (US 4124277, of record).

Regarding claim 15, Shimodaira is unclear as to what type of resin. Selection of such would have been within purview of one having ordinary skill in the art; however, it would have been obvious to use a resin from Applicant's claimed list because such is known in the art, as taught by Stang (column 3, lines 36-39).

Regarding claim 18, Shimodaira is unclear as to a thickness of the glass. Selection of such would have been within purview of one having ordinary skill in the art; however, it would have been obvious to use glass having a thickness that falls within Applicant's claimed range because such is known in the art, as taught by Stang (column 3, lines 18-22).

10. Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber et al. (US 3382137, of record).

With respect to claim 1, Schreiber teaches a method for forming a glass structure by providing a glass member 10 with a front surface and a rear surface and securing a rigid interlayer 11 to the rear surface of the glass member such that the rigid interlayer applied a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member (Figure 1; abstract; column 1, lines 55-61; column 1, line 71 – column 2, line 3; column 2, lines 8-11 and 25-27 and 34-38 and 50-54; column 4, line 63).

Schreiber teaches securing a plurality of glass members; therefore, it is within the scope of Schreiber to secure at least three glass members using at least two interlayers (first glass, first interlayer, second glass, second interlayer, third glass) such that the second glass layer, second

interlayer, and/or third glass layer reads on the reinforcing structure and support member being claimed by Applicant; especially since it is well known and conventional to form tri-laminates for the various articles disclosed by Schreiber (column 4, lines 58-65).

It is noted that Schreiber teaches that the glass structure can be used as a mirror (column 4, line 63).

Regarding claims 3-4, Schreiber teaches securing a plurality of glass members; therefore, it is within the scope of Schreiber to secure at least three glass members using at least two interlayers (glass, interlayer, glass, interlayer, glass) such that the second glass layer, second interlayer, and/or third glass layer reads on that being claimed by Applicant; especially since it is well known and conventional to form tri-laminates for the various articles disclosed by Schreiber (column 4, lines 58-65).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, selection of a particular curing temperature would have been within purview of the skilled artisan; it being noted that Schreiber teaches curing times and temperatures may be varied over wide ranges without affecting the results (column 3, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 6, the examiner would like to point out that the present claim language does not specify what the 'predetermined shape' is and therefore this limitation does not exclude shapes that are flat or planar. Furthermore, the present claim language does not specify what the 'forming' step is and therefore present claim 6 does not exclude providing a glass member and 'forming' the glass member to desired dimensions such that the glass member has a 'predetermined shape' that is rectangular or square, as taught by Schreiber.

However, if Applicant amends claim 6, it would have been obvious to form the glass member of Schreiber into a predetermined shape that is not flat or planar because it is well known and conventional in the glass laminate art to form glass members into non-flat/non-planar predetermined shapes (i.e. curved) before laminating the glass members to form a finished laminate that can be used as a safety window, mirror, etc. as disclosed by Schreiber (column 4, lines 58-65).

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to use a vacuum tool to form the glass member to its predetermined shape because such is notoriously well know and conventional in the glass forming art.

Regarding claim 8, the reference teaches the step of securing the rigid interlayer 11 to the glass member 10 comprising applying a resin over an area corresponding to a rear surface of the glass member and curing the resin to form the rigid interlayer (abstract).

Regarding claim 10, the reference teaches the glass member being a mirror (column 4, lines 61-63).

11. Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber et al. as applied to claims 1, 6-8 and 10 above, and further in view of Shimodaira et al. and/or Stang.

With respect to claim 11, all the limitations were addressed above with respect to claims 1, 8 and 10, except the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection and the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror.

As for the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror, Schreiber teaches such (abstract).

As for the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection, such would have been obvious since this is a known characteristic of mirrors, as taught by the collective teachings of Shimodaira (column 2, lines 24-25) and/or Stang (column 3, lines 22-26).

Regarding claim 12, Schreiber teaches such.

Regarding claims 13-14, please see the rejection of claim 6 above.

Regarding claim 15, Schreiber teaches such (column 2, lines 28-40).

Regarding claim 17, Schreiber teaches securing a plurality of glass members; therefore, it is within the scope of Schreiber to secure at least three glass members using at least two interlayers (glass, interlayer, glass, interlayer, glass) such that the third glass layer and the adjacent interlayer reads on that being claimed by Applicant.

Regarding claim 18, Schreiber teaches such (column 2, lines 25-27).

With respect to claim 19, all the limitations were addressed above with respect to claims 1, 10-13 and 17-18, except a reflective material associated with a surface of the glass panel to effect light reflection. It would have been obvious to have a reflective material associated with a surface of the glass member of Schreiber because such is known in the mirror art, as taught by the collective teachings of Shimodaira (column 2, lines 24-25) and/or Stang (column 3, lines 22-26).

12. Claims 1, 3-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stang in view of Shimodaira et al.

With respect to claim 1, Stang teaches a method for forming a glass structure by providing a glass member 12 with a front surface and a rear surface and securing a rigid interlayer 16 to the rear surface of the glass member (Figures 1 and 4-5; column 1, line 29 –

column 2, line 4; column 3, lines 15-47; column 4, lines 10-30). It is unclear as to whether the reference teaches the rigid interlayer applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member.

Stang teaches forming the rigid interlayer 16 by applying a pre-preg (fabric impregnated with uncured epoxy resin; column 3, lines 36-39) to the glass member 12 and then curing the resin (column 1, lines 58-60; column 3, lines 34-47; column 3, lines 10-30). Stang is unclear as to how curing takes place. It is known in the art to form a glass structure, similar to that disclosed by Stang, by applying a pre-preg 3 (fabric impregnated with uncured resin) to a glass member 7 and then curing the resin by heating to form a rigid interlayer 4, wherein the resin shrinks as it cures and applies a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member, as taught by Shimodaira (see paragraph 6 above for complete discussion).

Therefore, since epoxy resin is thermosetting and must be cured by heating, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to cure the resin of Stang by heating to form the rigid interlayer such that the resin shrinks as it cures and applies a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member because such is known in the art, as taught by Shimodaira, where this produces a strong/durable interlayer and hence a strong/durable laminate.

Stang teaches securing a reinforcing structure 18 to the rigid interlayer and securing a support member 16 to the reinforcing structure (Figures 2 and 4-5; column 3, lines 34-47).

Stang teaches the glass structure/member being a mirror (abstract).

Regarding claim 3, Stang teaches applying a reinforcing member (glass cloth), applying a resin to the reinforcing member to form the reinforcing structure 16, applying the reinforcing

structure to the rigid interlayer 16 and curing the resin to bond the reinforcing structure to the rigid interlayer (column 4, lines 10-30).

Regarding claim 4, Stang teaches such (column 4, lines 19-30).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, selection of a particular curing temperature would have been within purview of the skilled artisan; it being noted that Schreiber teaches curing times and temperatures may be varied over wide ranges without affecting the results.

Regarding claim 6, Stang teaches such (Figures).

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to use a vacuum tool to form the glass member to its predetermined shape because such is notoriously well know and conventional in the glass forming art.

Regarding claim 8, please see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 10, Stang teaches such (abstract).

With respect to claim 11, all the limitations were addressed above with respect to claims 1, 8 and 10, except the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection and the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror.

As for the mirror having a front surface that is associated with light reflection, Stang teaches such (column 3, lines 22-25).

As for the resin shrinking as it cures and applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror, Applicant is directed to the commentary made above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, Stang in view of Shimodaira teaches such.

Regarding claims 13-14, Stang teaches such (Figures).

Regarding claim 15, Stang in view of Shimodaira teaches such (see claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 17, Stang teaches the reinforcing structure including an interlayer 18 and a support structure 16 (outermost layer).

Regarding claim 18, Stang teaches such (column 3, lines 20-21).

With respect to claim 19, all the limitations were addressed above with respect to claims 1, 10-13 and 17-18, except a reflective material associated with a surface of the glass panel to effect light reflection and the reinforcing member 18 and support structure 16 (outermost layer) being applied to the resin before curing the resin to form the rigid interlayer 16.

As for the reflective material, Stang teaches such (column 3, lines 22-25).

As for applying the reinforcing member and support structure to the resin before curing thereof, Stang teaches such (column 4, lines 10-30).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 8/8/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. On p. 7 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Schreiber does not teach or disclose whatsoever maintaining the entire glass laminate in a state of compression.

The examiner would first like to point out that this argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed invention. The examiner would then like to point out that even if Applicant was to amend the claims, Schreiber does in fact teach the entire laminate in a state of compression (column 1, lines 55-60).

15. On p. 8 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Schreiber does not teach or disclose securing a reinforcing structure to the rigid interlayer or securing a support member to the reinforcing structure as now claimed.

The examiner invites Applicant to reread the rejection set forth in paragraph 11 above where the examiner set forth the following reasoning: Schreiber teaches securing a plurality of glass members; therefore, it is within the scope of Schreiber to secure at least three glass members using at least two interlayers (first glass, first interlayer, second glass, second interlayer, third glass) such that the second glass layer, second interlayer, and/or third glass layer reads on the reinforcing structure and support member being claimed by Applicant; especially since it is well known and conventional to form tri-laminates for the various articles disclosed by Schreiber (column 4, lines 58-65).

16. On p. 8, 13 and 15 of the remarks, Applicant argues that claim 6 requires forming the glass member into a predetermined shape and that Schreiber teaches away from forming the glass member into a predetermined shape because Schreiber teaches forming the laminate with C-clamps, which are incapable of imparting a shape to the glass.

First, the examiner would like to point out that the present claim language does not specify what the 'predetermined shape' is and therefore this limitation does not exclude shapes that are flat or planar. Furthermore, the present claim language does not specify what the 'forming' step is and therefore present claim 6 does not exclude providing a glass member and 'forming' the glass member to desired dimensions such that the glass member has a 'predetermined shape' that is rectangular or square, as taught by Schreiber.

However, as stated in the rejection above, if Applicant amends claim 6, it would have been obvious to form the glass member of Schreiber into a predetermined shape that is not flat or planar because it is well known and conventional in the glass laminate art to form glass members into non-flat/non-planar predetermined shapes (i.e. curved) before laminating the glass members

to form a finished laminate that can be used as a safety window, mirror, etc. as disclosed by Schreiber (column 4, lines 58-65).

As for Applicant's argument that the C-clamps are incapable of imparting a shape to the glass, the examiner points out that present claim 6 does not exclude forming the glass member into the 'predetermined shape' before laminating takes place.

17. On p. 9 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Shimodaira does not teach or suggest the resin being capable of overcoming the state of tension in the rear surface to place the rear surface in a state of compression.

The examiner would like to point out that the resin, which forms the rigid interlayer of the present invention, applies a compressive force to the glass member by virtue of the fact that the rigid interlayer shrinks as the resin cures (p. 5, last four lines of last paragraph). Therefore, since the rigid interlayer of Shimodaira also shrinks as the resin cures (column 3, lines 15-16), one would readily appreciate that the rigid interlayer of Shimodaira would also apply a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member.

18. On p. 9-10 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Shimodaira does not teach or suggest coupling a reinforcing structure to the rigid interlayer or securing a support member to the reinforcing structure to support the glass member.

The examiner disagrees with Applicant's position. As set forth in the rejection in paragraph 6 above, Shimodaira teaches securing a reinforcing structure 5 to the rigid interlayer and securing a support member 4a to the reinforcing structure (Figure 3; column 3, lines 24-38).

19. On p. 13-14 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Stang does not teach or suggest the resin applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror and therefore one would not modify Schreiber in view of this reference.

The examiner points out that in the rejection of claim 11, as set forth in paragraph 12 above, Stang was only used to show that it is known in the mirror art to have the front surface of the mirror be associated with light reflection.

20. On p. 15, 17 and 18 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Shimodaira teaches away from forming the light reflective surface until after forming the glass member.

As for claim 11, the examiner would like to point out that this claim is not limited to forming the light reflective surface until after forming the glass member. The claim only requires providing a mirror/glass member having a surface that is "associated with" light reflection. The claim language "associated with" does not mean that the surface has already been made capable of light reflection. It can mean that at some point later in the process the surface will be made to be light reflective and therefore it is 'associated with' light reflection until it is actually made to be light reflective. Furthermore, please note that nowhere else in claim 11 is a reflective surface ever mentioned.

As for claim 19, please note that the examiner withdrew the all rejections of this claim using Shimodaira as a primary reference.

The examiner would like to point out that Shimodaira was used as a secondary reference, in paragraph 11 above, to modify the glass member of Schreiber to have a reflective surface. However, the examiner used Stang as an alternative secondary reference to that of Shimodaira wherein Stang clearly teaches forming the reflective surface before forming the glass member.

21. At the top of p. 14 and in the 3rd paragraph on p. 19 of the remarks, Applicant argues that the epoxy resin of Stang hardens to thereby resist the natural tendency of the mirror to return to it undeflected state and therefore the reference fails to teach or suggest the resin applying a compressive force to the rear surface of the mirror.

First, the examiner would like to point out that Applicant's conclusion regarding the Stang reference is mere speculation. Regardless, the examiner would like to point out that the resin, which forms the rigid interlayer of the present invention, applies a compressive force to the glass member by virtue of the fact that the rigid interlayer shrinks as the resin cures (p. 5, last four lines of last paragraph). Therefore, since the rigid interlayer of Stang in view of Shimodaira also shrinks as the resin cures (see rejection in paragraph 12 above), one would readily appreciate that the rigid interlayer of Stang would also apply a compressive force to the rear surface of the glass member.

22. On p. 19 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Stang does not teach or suggest a support member or a rigid interlayer for supporting the glass member.

First, the examiner would like to point out that the present claims say nothing about the rigid interlayer supporting the glass member. Regardless, as admitted by Applicant at the top of p. 14 of his remarks, Stang does teach a rigid interlayer that supports the mirror. And as for a support member that supports the mirror, Stang teaches this also as set forth in paragraph 12 above (secures reinforcing structure 18 to rigid interlayer and secures support member 16 to reinforcing structure - Figures 2 and 4-5; column 3, lines 34-47).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jessica L. Rossi** whose telephone number is **571-272-1223**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard D. Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JESSICA ROSSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER